



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

rily admit the authority of experts, not the least in the affairs of government. This necessity, however much we may regret it, is nevertheless absolute, although totally ignored by the so-called communistic anarchists, like Bakunin, Krapotkin, Tolstoi, Most. The individualistic forms of anarchistic theory, if the term "theory" be not a misapplication, the teaching of Max Stirner, John Henry Mackay, *et al.*, are, quite naturally, treated less *in extenso*. Perhaps it would have been appropriate to make some mention at least of the American Benjamin Tucker, whose doctrines are based on Prudhon's.

But Dr. Friedländer does not aim to be critical only; he professes to be constructive in his review of Eugen Dühring's and Henry George's social theories, in both of which he discovers valuable corner stones for the structure of a future society juster and freer than the one we live in. With great interest we look forward to the appearance of the second part.

The statement, on p. 149, that the weekly *Freiheit* edited by Johann Most was discontinued in 1893 is to be revised. It was being published years after that, and is, I believe, still appearing in New York.

KARL DETLEV JESSEN.

*Droit et coutumes des populations rurales de la France en matière successorale.* By ALEXANDRE DE BRANDT. Translated from the German by EUGÈNE RÉGNIER, with a preface by GEORGES BLONDEL. Paris: L. Larose, 1901. 8vo, pp. xvi+371.

ALEXANDER VON BRANDT, a student of August Meitzen, describes in this book the hereditary laws and customs of the rural population of France. Before the French Revolution, the farms, according to the laws and customs existing in the various parts of the country, were either equally divided among all the heirs or at least all male heirs, or left to one heir alone (pp. 6, 18-68). The civil code introduced by Napoleon established for the whole country the principle of the equal division of the farms among all the heirs. The economic motive for that innovation was the expectation of an ensuing rapid growth of the number of small proprietors and at the same time an increase of the population. Nowadays many scholars, from Le Play to Bertillon, Parliament, the press, etc., make this same law responsible for the small increase of the French population. The farmers are said to have

but one child in order to avoid the parceling out of their farms (pp. 6 ff.).

Since the book of de Tocqueville on the Ancient Régime and the Revolution, the opinion prevails that the small rural property was extremely frequent even before the Revolution. "The effect of the Revolution," says de Tocqueville, "was not to divide the soil, but to free it for one moment." Brandt believes that the number of farmers owning small and medium-sized holdings was, relatively, about as large as today, while the territory covered by these farms was considerably smaller, and that occupied by the large holdings much greater (pp. 53-7). His description of the hereditary customs in the various parts of France in modern times (pp. 133-326) is partly based upon official investigations and private literature printed on the subject, and partly upon the personal impressions of the author and the results of an inquiry which he made through schedules sent to farmers and other competent persons.

In this conclusion (pp. 327-47) he comes to a result very unfavorable to the civil code. He does not believe that the salutary increase of the area covered by the small farms is due to the code, while he makes it responsible for the increase in the number of tenants. His main conclusions, however, are (1) that the fecundity of the rural population is smaller where an equal division of the farms takes place than in the districts where the custom of an integral transmission of the farm to one heir prevails, and that the latter alone prevents an aggregate decrease of the French population; and (2) that the principle of the division of the farms does not hold the rural population in the country, but drives them to a greater extent toward the cities than the custom of leaving the farm to one heir.

A careful study of the statistical tables contained in Brandt's book, however, shows that there is not a marked difference between the fecundity of the two groups of rural districts. Among the six geographical divisions into which Brandt divides France there are two, the northwest and the northeast, in which the equal partition altogether predominates. According to his figures, the number of children per family was here 2.04 (p. 166) and 2.07 (p. 323), against a total of 2.10 for the average of the country. In the other divisions there are among the districts with a low fecundity both those where the farms are divided and those where they are left to one heir, showing, on the whole, only a slight advantage in favor of the latter.

Various authors studying the same question in Germany have also

come to the conclusion that the emigration to the cities was larger from the districts where the farms were divided into severalty than from districts where they remained undivided. They never succeeded in proving it satisfactorily. The statistics available tended to show that they were wrong. This seems to be even more true for France. Brandt's own statistics show that his assertion is utterly wrong. The districts where the farms are divided seem to send, not only no more emigrants toward the cities, but rather less.

While, then, the conclusions which Brandt reaches are by no means justified by his detailed discussion of the conditions, this descriptive part is so full of interesting material that his book after all has to be considered as a valuable addition to the literature of inheritance laws and customs in continental Europe.

R. R. K.

---

*Tramway Companies and Local Authorities.* Being a Collection of Special Provisions Contained in Private Acts of Parliament of Tramway Companies, and Relating Particularly to the Interests of Local Authorities. Compiled and arranged by FRANK NOEL KEEN. London: Merritt & Hatcher, 1902. 8vo, pp. 295.

THIS volume is, as the title indicates, a compilation of the various private acts of Parliament touching the relations between tramway companies and local authorities. The general provisions regulating these conditions are laid down in the Tramways Act of 1870, and these grants are in the nature of special privileges authorized by local act of Parliament. These provisions cover all phases of the relation between the local authorities and the railway companies. They concern the method of constructing, altering, maintaining, and repairing of roads and track, interference with drains, pipes, wires, etc., character of car service, rate of fares, terms and time of purchase of tramways by city, and a great variety of miscellaneous provisions.

Many of these items are of great importance to those interested in the proper adjustment of the terms of contract between cities and railway companies. This is particularly true of the frequent provision made for penny fares and in London for a workingman's rate of a farthing a mile. It is also of interest to note the grant to the city in some case, to use, free of charge, the tracks of the company between midnight and 5 A. M. for the removal of refuse and other waste; and also the stipulation that the company shall light the streets, or in som